United Nations A/AC.253/16/Add.8

General Assembly

Distr.: General
10 February 2000

Original: English

Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the General Assembly on the Implementation of the Outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and Further Initiatives
Second session
3-14 April 2000
Item 2 of the provisional agenda*
Preparations for the special session of the General Assembly on the implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and further initiatives

Review reports and proposals for further action and initiatives submitted by organs and specialized agencies of the United Nations system and other concerned organizations

Note by the Secretary-General

Addendum

Contribution from the United Nations Children's Fund**

1. The Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the General Assembly on the Implementation of the Outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and Further Initiatives, in paragraph 19 of the annex to decision 1,[1] requested the Secretary-General in conjunction with the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), the World Bank, the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee and other relevant organizations, to report and make proposals on the various dimensions of the implementation of the 20/20 initiative in the light of declining official development assistance, in line with the Oslo and Hanoi consensus, for consideration by the Preparatory Committee at its second substantive session. The Preparatory Committee requested that the report also be made available to the Commission for Social Development at its thirty-eighth session.

* A/AC.253/12.
** The report is being issued herewith as received in the language of submission only.

00-28956 (E) 170200

2. The Secretary-General accordingly circulates herewith, for the information of the Preparatory Committee and the Commission, the report of UNICEF, which was prepared in consultation with UNDP, UNFPA, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the World Bank.

Notes

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 45* (A/54/45 and corrigendum), chap. VI, sect. B.

20/20 for 2015: a partnership for reaching the social development goals

Future directions in implementing the 20/20 initiative

Summary

Since its recommendation at the 1995 World Summit for Social Development, the precepts of 20/20 have become better known and the principle that it encapsulates – of joint and equal partnership between developing and developed countries in the drive to accelerate improvements in human well-being and capacity – has gained legitimacy. 20/20 has moved from an aspiration concerning social investments towards a practical partnership for reaching the goals for social development and for reducing poverty. The trend fostered by 20/20 is towards increases and improved spending on basic social services, and better monitoring of both inputs and outcomes. Among the tools and frameworks in place to meet the global goals for 2015, 20/20 has earned its place and usefulness. It deserves continued support.

The report suggests four future steps for consideration: (i) developing and developed countries should continue to use existing fora and arrangements to strengthen their 20/20 partnership for universal access to basic social services, through a combination of increased spending, better spending and enhanced integration and co-ordination; (ii) developing countries should continue to monitor 20/20, and implement it through existing mechanisms and ongoing fora; (iii) developed countries should continue to provide comprehensive reporting on ODA allocations to basic social services, and support 20/20 at all relevant fora and operational opportunities, and (iv) UN agencies, funds and programmes should continue to support 20/20 partnerships at global, national and sub-national levels, assist in building capacity and tools for regular assessments, and document and disseminate examples of good practices in the implementation of 20/20.

I. Introduction

This paper has been prepared to meet the requirement outlined in document A/AC.253/L.7/Rev.1, issued by the first Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the General Assembly on the Implementation of the Outcome of the World Summit for Social Development. The relevant paragraph (No. 19) reads as follows: '[The Preparatory Committee] *Requests* the Secretary-General in conjunction with UNICEF, UNDP, UNFPA, the World Bank, OECD/DAC and other relevant organisations, to report and make proposals on the various dimensions of the implementation of the 20/20 Initiative, in the light of declining official development assistance, in line with the Oslo and Hanoi consensus, for consideration by the Preparatory Committee at its second substantive session; the report should also be made available to the Commission for Social Development at its 38th session.'

20/20 is an initiative to help achieve the goals for social development agreed at the world summits and global conferences that took place during the 1990s. At its simplest, 20/20 signals a reciprocal commitment by developing and developed countries to increase their investment in basic social services from current levels to the indicative level of 20 per cent of the national budget and 20 per cent of ODA. The formula 20/20 is aspirational, not fixed, and is intended to underline a new partnership and express the principle of shared responsibility. More fundamentally, 20/20 is a partnership that seeks to achieve universal access to quality basic social services.

The full range of the global goals encompasses a comprehensive set of poverty characteristics, expressed in levels of infant and child mortality, maternal mortality, illiteracy, malnutrition, access to basic education, access to reproductive health care, and to water supplies and sanitation. The goals' attainment would directly contribute to a world that is free of poverty. It would also equip the poor to increase their incomes, to participate more meaningfully in economic and social life, and to empower them to enjoy their fundamental social and economic rights.

The underlying rationale for 20/20 is the need to devote sufficient resources to the attainment of the goals, from both domestic and external sources. The 20/20 idea encapsulates both a commitment to social progress, and an agreement by developing and developed nations to reallocate resources to this end. Efforts to promote basic social services and to reallocate resources within and between sectors will have to be redoubled if real progress is to be made towards the 2015 goals. Resource generation will also need to be accompanied by reforms to make spending more equitable and more efficient.

This report reviews experience to date with 20/20 – both in terms of positive achievements and in terms of constraints encountered. It goes on to recommend how these experiences can be built upon to achieve universal coverage of basic social services in an integrated and co-ordinated fashion within the range of ongoing activities for human development and poverty reduction.

II. The global context

The need to address directly the social dimensions of poverty has been the subject of intense

discussion since the 1950s. There has never been any question that the reduction of poverty was the key purpose of development, but the accord on ends was not always translated in an agreement on the means: should investments be directed towards the promotion of economic growth or should poverty reduction be achieved through investments in social areas to underpin human rights and social justice. The parameters of this debate have been frequently revisited ever since their lines were first drawn during the preparations for the Second UN Development Decade.

During the 1980s, economic and social progress in many poorer countries suffered a series of shocks: declining per capita income, an accumulating burden of debt, and disappointing results from programmes of structural adjustment, to which in some countries were added conflict and the onset of the HIV/AIDS epidemic. The numbers of absolute poor and of refugee and displaced populations rose remorselessly. As a result of systemic analyses of development and co-operation processes warranted by this 'lost development decade', conviction has since taken hold within all parts of the international community that there has to be concerted public action on behalf of both poor people and poor nations. The depth of this conviction is illustrated by its repeated expression in the Declarations and Programmes of Action emanating from the summits and conferences of the 1990s, including the World Summit for Social Development.

During the 1990s, the debate about development turned an important corner, by recognising that social investments are as vital as economic investments. UN agencies, funds and programmes have repeatedly argued that efforts to improve human well-being and capacity were integral to poverty reduction. Improving access to basic health and basic education and empowering communities to contribute to their management should not wait until the day when economic growth had produced the wherewithal to pay for service delivery. Today, approaches that in the past were often dismissed as welfarist or ideologically driven, are accepted in the mainstream of development thinking.

This is the context in which the rationale of 20/20 needs to be perceived. The objective of universal access to basic education and basic health, including basic nutrition, safe drinking water, sanitation, and reproductive health and family planning – which lies at the heart of 20/20 – is also central to human development and poverty reduction. Today, as was not the case in 1994 when the initiative was first articulated, this reality is far more widely acknowledged.

The characteristic for which 20/20 was initially best known is its indicative spending target. This characteristic, too, has a long history. At the outset of the development era, a special resource allocation mechanism – Official Development Assistance (ODA) – was created for the transfer of resources from high-income to low-income-countries. In the run-up to the Second Development Decade of the 1970s, an ODA target of 0.7 per cent of developed countries' gross national product was set. Although it was formally accepted by the General Assembly, few developed countries have consistently reached the target. During the 1990s, ODA flows have sharply declined, reaching an all-time low of 0.22 per cent of DAC members' combined GNP in 1997 – before showing signs of recovery in 1998. Cuts in aid budgets partly reflect disillusion with the results of past development co-operation. The transfer of funds, even when accompanied by up-to-date technology and expertise, has not *per se* proved instrumental for promoting human

development or reducing poverty. The absorptive setting is important; it can be improved through public sector reforms, institutional and human capacity building, administrative decentralisation, and participation by civil society. Thus, questions relating to ODA today relate as much to its use in programmes that will bring about equitable, efficient and sustainable development, as to the volume of aid flows.

20/20, in raising questions about allocations of budgetary and ODA resources, played an important part in moving international thinking towards a more strategic assessment of how resources can be used effectively to promote human development. 20/20 captures the idea of partnership, in which there is a shared commitment to social progress and poverty reduction by a joint process of fiscal reorganisation, aid reallocation, efficiency savings, equity gains, and engagement with the wider society.

The central components of 20/20 can therefore be seen to have derived from the evolution of ideas concerning development and aid since the 1950s. The legitimacy of these new ideas has gained rapid ground since 1995. A number of international initiatives, including the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) initiative and the related poverty reduction strategy papers, as well as the DAC International Development Strategy, are grounded in the acceptance that social investments and reforms alongside economic ones, are critical to equitable, efficient and sustainable – and poverty-reducing – development. Not only at the instigation of 20/20, but from concerned non-governmental organisations and other civil society institutions in developing and developed countries, has come an expression of determination to monitor development expenditures, with a view to their effective use in anti-poverty activities.

However, in the course of actual implementation, 20/20 has thrown up many challenges. The ultimate utility of the 20/20 concept depends on how effectively those challenges can be addressed and surmounted.

III. The challenges

Since the initiative was first launched in 1994, the term 20/20 has gained widespread currency. Although the simplicity of its name has given 20/20 recognition value, it has also led occasionally to over-simplified interpretation. Perhaps inevitably, the resource allocation and spending dimension was given more attention than the dimension of partnership and the need for reforms for achieving universal access to basic social services of good quality. Sometimes, the twin 20 per cent targets have been interpreted too formalistically or assumed that 20/20 was less a joint commitment to social investment than some new imposition of conditionality. Concern was also expressed that 20/20 over-emphasised inputs to basic social services and under-emphasised social outcomes – measurable gains in human well-being and capacity.

Increased advocacy and explanation of the concept have gradually helped to dispel such misinterpretations. Two international 20/20 meetings with participation from interested governments, multilateral and non-governmental organisations have been held since Copenhagen – in Oslo in April 1996 and in Hanoi in October 1998. These have facilitated consensus on the

parameters of 20/20 at country and international level and made recommendations for further 20/20 action. However, not everyone is yet fully aware of the virtues of the 20/20 partnership framework and the need to build 20/20 precepts into the many policy reviews and development co-operation fora, including Consultative Groups, Round Tables, public expenditure reviews and the poverty reduction strategy paper. In many of these fora and documents, the case can be put more forcefully that increased access to basic social services is essential to laying the solid foundation for human development and poverty reduction.

The early focus of attention tended to emphasise the need for additional resources. However, it quickly became apparent that achieving universal coverage would not be practicable within most countries unless – besides increased funding – appropriate reforms were identified so as to enhance the equity and efficiency of public and ODA spending on basic social services.

In many countries where data gathering and analysis systems are poorly resourced, the information base is inadequate to monitor inputs and social outcomes. Its design does not reflect the concern about the quality of services. It has become clear that systems to monitor budgetary outlays and social service delivery need to be fine-tuned so that investments in basic social services (from internal and external sources) could be captured, and the outcomes of such investments adequately tracked.

IV. Addressing the challenges

Having identified these constraints and opportunities, they were addressed within the following framework: (a) a policy dialogue on 20/20; (b) the development of technical tools to implement 20/20; and (c) building human capacity, skills and knowledge at different levels of society from community level upwards for implementing 20/20. The documents mentioned in the annex on suggested reading regarding 20/20 contains more information and analytical details on 20/20 work since 1995.

a) 20/20 policy dialogue

20/20 advocacy has stressed the social, ethical, economic and human rights arguments in favour of public funding of basic social services. UN agencies, funds and programmes have tried to incorporate 20/20 precepts into ongoing deliberations at the international level. The effort has paid off in terms of improved understanding of the full dimensions of 20/20 and the creation of a climate favourable to higher investments in basic social services. Universal access will not be attained if the services are not provide free or well below cost.

The principal locus of 20/20 policy dialogue has progressively moved to the country level. This has yielded impressive results in a number of countries. In many instances, dialogues have been precipitated by 20/20 country studies (see below). The studies provided an opportunity to clarify many features of the initiative, which were not fully articulated at the outset – in some cases deliberately since their resolution has to take country-specific variables into account. The delineation of basic social services and their sectoral homes vary from country to country, and a

wide range of interpretation has been revealed as to what constitutes basic services as opposed to all social services. It has proven difficult to extract information about investments in basic social services from existing budgetary and accounting procedures.

The dialogue has also helped to illuminate the appropriate level of allocations to basic social services in a given setting, taking into account the existing coverage and quality of services. Countries with very weak systems for delivery of basic social services and low budgets usually have to spend more, proportionately, than others with better infrastructures. Thus, the desirable format for '20/20' may turn out to be different levels of expenditures, depending on country-specific conditions. 20/20 is not an approach exclusively appropriate for the poorest countries; it is equally applicable in middle-income countries where pockets of people remain unreached, or where quality and equity issues in service delivery offers scope for improvements. Action to provide access to basic social services in remote or difficult terrain, or where there is instability, violence or insecurity, may be proportionately quite costly.

Opportunities for a policy dialogue on 20/20 and its implications are multiplying. Increasingly, support for basic social services is gradually moving away from stand-alone projects that are capital and foreign exchange intensive, heavily dependent on products and expertise from developed countries, and rarely interconnect with local technical and managerial capacity or local customers and users. The trend now is in favour of multi-partner approaches to a whole sector such as health or education – known as Sector-Wide Approaches. The poverty reduction strategy paper, recently adopted under the enhanced HIPC initiative represents another framework for joint action consistent with 20/20 precepts.

Outcomes: A number of countries have raised their inputs to basic social services and implemented budget reforms; others have developed new budget processes that attach greater priority to basic social services. In most 20/20 study countries, social sector ministries used their results in budget discussions with Ministries of Finance to argue for increased allocations. In some countries, such as Cameroon and Colombia, parliamentarians were briefed on budget allocations to basic social services before voting on the national budget and National Development Plan respectively. In at least five countries – Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Malawi, Niger and Viet Nam – allocations to these services have specifically been raised in Consultative Groups and Round Tables as a result of the internalisation of 20/20 ideas. Nepal has continued to monitor the budget allocations to basic social services since the first 20/20 study was carried out in 1994. Representatives from 17 sub-Saharan African countries agreed on principles of cost-sharing in education and health – known as the Addis Ababa Consensus. Country studies have been used to extol to the media and civil society the importance of investments in basic social services. At the international level, the enhanced HIPC initiative provides an opportunity – and a commitment by the international community – to support a re-allocation of domestic resources towards basic social services and other poverty reduction measures.

b) 20/20 technical tools

A key conclusion of the Oslo meeting on 20/20 was that the dearth of information on budgetary and ODA allocations to basic social services was inhibiting a meaningful policy debate.

Weakness of analysis of development policies and programmes are typically a major obstacle to sound investments and positive outcomes. It was therefore agreed that efforts should be made to establish social and economic data collection systems that would both track social investment inputs from all sources and monitor basic social services in terms of outcomes. This was the inspiration for the 20/20 country studies already mentioned, which were funded by Norway and technically assisted by UNICEF, UNDP and UNFPA. The studies have been undertaken in more than 30 countries. While they proved a vehicle for policy dialogue and advocacy, their primary purpose was to gain the most detailed possible picture of existing patterns of basic social services investment. With funding from the Netherlands, UNICEF, UNDP and OECD have reviewed donor reporting systems in order to recommend to the DAC group a methodology for comparable assessment of support for basic social services.

The country studies examined the following three issues: (i) What shares of the national budget and ODA are being spend on basic social services? (ii) Who benefits from health and education investments? and (iii) How efficient are these investments? In the course of their work, the studies were also able to identify methodological and technical gaps in data collection and analysis processes.

The studies suggested that relatively few countries have made clear policy and programmatic distinctions between social services and *basic* social services. There is still a tendency to regard basic social services as lower-cost – and therefore inferior – alternatives to conventional services, rather than as a system-wide approach to providing everyone with access to basic education and basic health care, including other basic services, and – via in-built referral mechanisms – to more elevated service provision levels.

Few countries are in a position to extract expenditures on basic services from the total health, education, or other social spending. Expenditures on, for example, high-tech hospitals, universities and urban piped-water supply, are not distinguishable from those on district hospitals, rural health posts, primary schools and village handpumps. Public expenditure reviews are seldom able to portray investments in basic social services. The picture is further complicated by the fact that the current trend towards decentralisation of services has not usually been designed to allow for tracking of expenditure on basic social services. Extensive re-design of budget mechanisms in all the areas of basic social services is required.

The evidence from the 20/20 studies suggests that governments allocate between 12-14 per cent of the national budget to basic social services. DAC Development Co-operation Reports have started to include the share of basic health and basic education in total ODA. These figures show that basic education and basic health absorb less than 5 per cent of ODA, and that their share does not seem to have increased in recent years. But 20/20 country studies suggest that aggregate data reported to the DAC Secretariat do not capture all donor support for basic social services. 20/20 studies suggest that developed countries provide, on average, between 10–15 per cent of ODA in support of these services. The volatility in the ODA share is much greater than that in the national budgets.

The studies also showed that social services expenditures frequently by-pass the poor, and serve

those whose needs are relatively better met. The distribution of spending on basic social services, however, was found to be less regressive.

The studies also found that the lion's share of spending on basic social services comes in the form of salaries and wages – often leaving meagre resources for essential non-salary inputs such as textbooks, medical supplies and spare parts for handpumps. The inadequacy of these non-wage inputs can work against the positive impact of public spending on key social indicators. Small amounts can go a long way, so that the impact of any amount of additional resources on quality of basic social services can be substantial.

Outcomes: Although the 20/20 country studies contain inconsistencies and the data are uneven, they have nonetheless produced a useful first synthesis of patterns of investment in basic social services. The visibility of social goals, the availability of external support in their favour, and the 20/20 focus on universal access to basic social services are having a positive effect. However, the shortfall in global investment for achieving universal access remains large. It is estimated at approximately one-third of current spending – or approximately $80 billion per year in 1995 prices. This means that universal access to basic social services is not foreseeable at present. For a great number of countries, the studies have shown that servicing foreign debt crowds out allocations to basic social services. DAC member countries have agreed on a methodology, which will allow a more comprehensive and comparable assessment of assistance in support of basic social services. At the global level, the DAC Secretariat will present such an assessment to the review of the Social Summit in 2000.

c) 20/20 capacity building

While the need for a greater absorptive capacity in the social sectors has been acknowledged – notably in the Oslo and Hanoi Consensus – this has been the least developed under the 20/20 imprimatur. Many 20/20 country studies identified major inefficiencies in all social sectors and considerable scope for making efficiency gains. The goal of universal access to basic social services cannot be reached without, firstly, strong political commitment – that is expressed in additional resources – and secondly, an expansion of capacity at all levels to plan, build, and manage services, complementing and going beyond the technical tools for gathering information described above. Improvements in the efficiency and equity of public spending on basic social services would be greatly facilitated if overall allocation levels were increased. 20/20 has played an important role in helping generate a greater level of political commitment to access to basic social services and shaping the technical tools for monitoring progress towards this outcome. These are essential first steps towards implementation. But they are not sufficient.

Policy commitment to achieving universal access to basic social services needs awareness raising among all sections of government and civil society. Not only structures and mechanisms, but also mind-sets have to be changed. System-wide design of services, building on community structures and management capacity, and drawing upon non-governmental and private sector partners are required to reach universal coverage. The challenge is to build that capacity in all relevant areas of society and administration.

Outcomes: The Hanoi meeting moved the 20/20 debate a considerable distance forward in reaching a consensus that developing countries should take the lead and initiate steps to expand coverage and improve the quality of basic social services. Agreement was also reached that debt relief should directly support basic social services – a point that is now part of the enhanced HIPC initiative. Consensus also exists that active collaboration should be sought with civil society and the private sector, to ensure that resources are well spent. Budgets are already being redesigned in some 20/20 study countries to promote effective service delivery. For example, in Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, Niger and Senegal budget allocations and capacity are being decentralised to centres of service delivery. In Dominican Republic, municipalities have been seeking advice on how to allocate resources to basic social services and improve budget execution. In Ecuador, 20/20 has prompted the design of mechanisms to protect expenditures on basic social services during the structural adjustment process, while ensuring consistency between social and macroeconomic policies. During the execution of the country studies, regional networks made up of government officials and experts concerned about investment in basic social services were strengthened or established.

Within the next few years, it is to be confidently anticipated that examples of this kind of 20/20 capacity building follow-up will multiply.

V. Ways forward

From an initiative launched by the UN agencies, funds and programmes, 20/20 has already entered an era when its implementation resides at the national and sub-national levels. The international community will have to continue to play a crucial role in mobilising resources, providing technical assistance and support where requested. Donor agencies will also have to explore further how to report their financial support for basic social services more systematically. This is the new framework for 20/20 in the immediate future.

a) 20/20: country level activity

The task: The advancement of 20/20 at the national and sub-national country level requires a three-pronged approach: (i) continued policy dialogue: advocacy to promote the 20/20 concept with decision-makers, parliamentarians, media, non-governmental organisations and civil society generally; (ii) improving the information base: technical support to improve the design and management of data management systems to report on the expansion of basic social services, including the establishment of key indicators for assessing coverage and quality, and monitoring progress towards the attainment of the internationally agreed social development goals; and (iii) *capacity building: development of professional and technical expertise to plan and carry out the* expansion and sustenance of basic social services of good quality.

The Strategy: Each country will need to develop its own strategy for the implementation of the 20/20 process, based on country-specific circumstances. This strategy can be developed within a number of frameworks already available for the articulation of policies and programmes directed at poverty reduction and human development. These include sector-wide approaches and the poverty reduction strategy paper. The common themes of these frameworks are: shared

responsibility between governments in developing and developed countries, multilateral organisations and non-governmental organisations to jointly agreed and co-ordinated inputs for social development. Within these frameworks, advocacy of the 20/20 perspective will emphasise the many requirements needed for expansion of the coverage and quality basic social services, as a pre-condition for fulfilling the agreed goals for child and maternal mortality, reproductive health, nutrition, education, literacy, water supplies, environmental sanitation, set for 2015.

The following components will need to be considered: (i) social assessment and analysis, within a rights perspective, fully integrated with economic and financial planning; (ii) restructuring the national budget and ODA with a view to narrowing the existing financing gap for achieving universal access to basic social services of good quality; (iii) reforms of the delivery system of basic social services, with decentralisation of decision-making to lowest practicable level, and an emphasis on demand management and participation of civil society; (iv) investment in capacity building at all levels and in all relevant sectors for access and quality improvement in basic social services; (v) social mobilisation through information, education and communications campaigns to enhance civil society's participation.

b) 20/20: international activity

The task: At the international level, the task is twofold. First, to promote and facilitate 20/20-related activity at the country level, supporting it wherever possible with resources, expertise, technical advice, information, and networking. There is also a continuing need to synthesise and publish work undertaken by countries to support 20/20, so as to promote good practices in other countries and build up a body of information and expertise to be drawn upon. The UN partners will continue to facilitate international 20/20 networks, creating shared information bases and a 20/20 website, publishing and disseminating 'good practice' examples, and other activities designed to support country-level activity.

The second task is for the developed countries must strengthen their commitment to increase ODA levels and rise the share directed in support of basic social services to fulfil the DAC Shaping the 21st Century agenda. The donor community should improve reporting on ODA support for basic social services. Consideration should be given to the further development of mechanisms to monitor aggregate donor progress towards the indicative 20 per cent for support to basic social services. Higher aid priority to basic social services and tangible results in terms of access and quality could strengthen the political support for development assistance and thus help reverse the downward ODA trend experienced during most of the 1990s.

The strategy: The emphasis should be on refining and using existing frameworks for collaborative efforts for achieving universal coverage of basic social services. To support country-level activity, a flexible formula will be advisable. When all parties agree to invest more and invest better in basic social services, one or two members of the donor community in that country could play the role of '20/20 principal advocate' with donor colleagues so that basic social services will gradually receive a higher share of ODA to match the government's efforts to achieve universal coverage in the shortest possible time. However, 20/20 should be owned and principally led by the government, in consultation with civil society and with its participation. At

the international level, 20/20 should be carried forward by the existing partnership of organisations – UNICEF, UNDP, UNFPA, the World Bank, UNESCO and WHO.

VI. 20/20: an ethical and economic imperative

Within five short years, 20/20 has been transformed from an aspirational ideal towards a practical partnership for universal access to basic social services of good quality. 20/20 has played a role in changing the thinking that social investments are a vital contribution to human development and poverty reduction. Its precepts of joint partnership and shared responsibility complement and dovetail with sector wide approaches and the enhanced HIPC initiative. 20/20 also represents a partnership framework for the fulfilment of the rights of children, women, and of all vulnerable and marginalised people who have yet to secure for themselves the means of a healthy and productive existence.

Since the Hanoi Consensus of 1998, a map has been laid down for the way forward for 20/20. Leadership for the initiative is at the national and sub-national levels, where examples of budgetary change, institutional reform, capacity building, and monitoring are multiplying. The role of the international 20/20 effort will be to continue lending support in all areas – resources mobilisation, technical support and networking – to promote 20/20 implementation on the ground. Implementation will be most successful and sustainable if it is done through mainstreaming 20/20 in existing mechanisms and fora, rather than by creating separate processes and new reporting systems.

Evidence suggests that progress in social development is not keeping pace with promises, for a variety of reasons, including under-investment in basic social services. Millions of children – primarily from poor families – are denied their social and economic rights; even though the resources, knowledge and techniques are available to give all children a good start in life. The financing gap to guarantee universal coverage of a minimum package of basic social services in developing countries represents less than one-third of 1 per cent of global annual income. Seldom has the international community had an investment opportunity that is so noble in its objective and so productive in its outcome. It is far less expensive to break the hold of destitution in terms of basic social services than bearing the moral and economic costs of permitting poverty to persist and increase.

There is still time to use all the tools and frameworks at the disposal of governments and their partners to accelerate progress towards the fulfilment of the 2015 goals. Among these tools and frameworks, 20/20 has earned its place and usefulness. It deserves continued support.

VII. Draft recommendation

The Second Preparatory Committee may wish to consider the following suggested steps for future action:

- Developing and developed countries should continue to strengthen their 20/20 partnership for

universal access to basic social services, through a combination of increased and better spending on these services and on enhanced integration and co-ordination of efforts. The membership and mechanisms of 20/20 partnership should be kept flexible, depending on country-specific circumstances. Existing fora, initiatives and reporting arrangements should be used to the maximum extent possible.

- Developing countries should continue to monitor 20/20, and discuss its implementation at relevant fora such as Consultative Group and Round Table meetings, public expenditure reviews, national human development reports, and the poverty reduction strategy paper, with a view to increasing budget and aid allocations and agreeing on specific sectoral reforms.
- Developed countries should increase ODA allocations to basic social services and provide comprehensive reporting on ODA allocations to basic social services. They should also support 20/20 at all relevant fora and operational opportunities.
- UN agencies, funds and programmes should continue to support 20/20 partnerships and policy dialogue at global, national and sub-national levels. They should continue their assistance with capacity building and the development of technical tools to foster regular 20/20 assessments at the national and sub-national levels. They should also document progress and disseminate examples of good practice in the implementation of 20/20.

Annex: Suggested Reading on 20/20

Implementing the 20/20 Initiative, UNDP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNICEF, WHO, and the World Bank. UNICEF, New York, 1998 (available in English, French and Spanish).

Background documents prepared for the Hanoi Meeting (available in English, French and Spanish):

- 'Universal access to basic social services: a key ingredient for human development.' UNICEF and the World Bank, New York, 1998.

- 'Country experiences in assessing the adequacy, equity and efficiency of public spending on basic social services.' UNICEF and UNDP, with contributions from UNFPA and the World Bank, New York, 1998.

- 'Better reporting on donor support to basic social services: opportunities and constraints.' Development Initiatives, OECD/DCD and UNICEF, New York, 1998.

- 'Working together to promote the 20/20 Initiative: the role of CGs, RTs, PERs, SALs, and NHDRs.' UNDP and the World Bank, New York, 1998.

- 'Report of the Hanoi Meeting.' UNICEF, New York, 1999.

'Hanoi Conference on the 20/20 Initiative.' by K. Richelle, in *Social Development Review*, Vol. 2, No. 4, December 1998.

Development Co-operation 1998 Report, 'Chapter 4: Trends and issues in the supply of aid.' OECD/DAC, Paris, 1999.

Gasto Público en Servicios Sociales Básicos en Latinoamerica y el Caribe, joint publication by ECLAC, UNDP and UNICEF edited by E. Ganuza, A. León, and P. Sauma, Impresiones Universitaria S.A., Santiago de Chile, 1999 (available in Spanish).